REMARKS

As requested in the accompanying Request for Change of Correspondence Address, applicant requests that future correspondence regarding this application be directed as follows:

Roger R. Wise
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
725 South Figueroa Street, Ste. 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended. Claims 19-21 have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

In the January 13, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,269,398 to Leong et al. ("Leong"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Embodiments of the present invention are directed to a router having a routing component that implements routing protocols for data processed by the router. A user can view and modify features of the router in real-time via an interface component. The interface component presents the features of the router to the user as a hierarchical tree having attributes that store values relating to the router protocols and components that represent functionality of the router protocols, the components containing one or more sub-components or attributes.

In the January 13, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Leong. The Examiner stated that Leong discloses a routing component that implements routing protocols for data processed by

the router, an interface component through which a user may view and modify features of the router. The Examiner also asserted that the interface component presents the features of the router as a hierarchical tree.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites (with emphasis added):

> 1. A router comprising:
> a routing component that implements routing protocols for data processed by the router; and
> an interface component for a user to view and **modify features of the router in real-time**, the interface component **presenting the features of the router to the user as a hierarchical tree** having attributes that store values relating to the router protocols and components that represent functionality of the router protocols, the components containing one or more sub-components or attributes.

Leong discloses a system and method for *monitoring* remote routers in networks for available protocols and providing a graphical representation of information received from the routers. Leong further teaches providing an interface allowing a network manager to view the status of a router and to issue commands, such as Telnet commands, to the router. [Col. 4, lines 17-20.] Leong also discloses a method and apparatus for "iconifying" a router network management session allowing review of the status of a router.

Leong is therefore directed to the display of the general configuration of a router, router fault information, and performance information. However, Leong does not disclose, teach, or suggest a router having an interface component for a user to view and *modify features of the router in real-time*. Accordingly, whereas the teachings of Leong are directed to the *monitoring* of a router, independent claim 1, as amended, specifies *modifying features* of the router in *real-time*. Independent claim 1, as amended, further recites that *the interface component presents the features of the*

router to the user as a ***hierarchical tree***. Leong does not disclose, teach, or suggest any such hierarchical tree being presented to a user. Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over Leong.

Claims 2-6 and 19 all depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, as amended, and therefore also distinguish over Leong for the same reasons as those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended. Independent claims 7 and 13, each as amended, contain limitations similar to those of independent claim 1, and therefore also distinguish over Leong for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 8-12 and 20 all depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 7, as amended, and therefore also distinguish over Leong for the same reasons as those set forth above with respect to independent claim 7, as amended. Claims 14-18 and 21 all depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 13, as amended, and therefore also distinguish over Leong for the same reasons as those set forth above with respect to independent claim 13, as amended.

Moreover, new claim 19 further distinguishes over Leong. New claim 19 recites (with emphasis added): "The router of claim 1, the router operating after an initial initialization and *the attributes being modified after the initial initialization, but before a subsequent initialization*." As discussed above, Leong contains no teaching of modifying the router in real-time. Loeng also therefore does not disclose, teach, or suggest the attributes of the hierarchical tree being modified after the initial initialization, but before a subsequent initialization. It is well-known that conventional routers have the same functional priority (i.e., their organizational structure is "flat"), so

that changing one option may impact the effect of other options. Accordingly, due to this flat nature, conventional routers have to be reinitialized even when only minor configuration changes are made, thereby preventing such conventional routers from operating in real-time.

Accordingly, new claim 19 further distinguishes over Leong. New claims 20 and 21 contain limitations similar to those in new claim 19, and therefore also further distinguish over Loeng for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to new claim 19.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

Applicant believes that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call either of the undersigned attorneys at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: March 13, 2003

By: _____
James M. Wakely
Registration No. 48,597
Attorney For Applicant

Date: March 13, 2003

By: _____
Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Attorney For Applicant

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033